UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,180	08/21/2003	Joseph Celi JR.	AUS920030375US1	7312

35525   7590   04/21/2009
IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
TRAN, TUYETLIEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 February 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 41</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 41</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communication: the amendment filed on

02/12/09. **This action is made final.**

2.   Claims 1, 41 are pending in the case. Claim 1 is independent claim.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "the user" recited

in line 25 of the claim lacks the antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by
> the manner in which the invention was made.

> This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the
> claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various
> claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any
> evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out
> the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later
> invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)
> and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuli (Patent**

No US 6,941,382 B1; hereinafter Tuli_A) in view of Tuli (Pub. No. US 2001/0028470 A1;

hereinafter Tuli_B) further in view of Robotham et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0015042 A1;

hereinafter Robotham).

        As to claim 1, Tuli_A teaches:

A computer-implemented method for displaying a web page on a display screen of a hand held device (e.g., see Fig. 1 and col. 1, lines 29-40) comprising:

accessing the web page through a proxy (e.g., the web page is accessed through a host computer 1 as shown in Fig. 1; wherein the host computer connects to the Internet and provide web page bit map images to the client device);

determining if the size of the web page is larger than a display screen (e.g., see col. 2 lines 34-38 and lines 54-63; wherein the image file 5 to be displayed in a browser window 6 is usually larger than the displayable area of the browser window); and

responsive to a determination that the web page is larger than the display screen (e.g., see col. 2 lines 38-47 and lines 54-63), performing steps comprising:

creating a web page bitmap image of the web page (e.g., translating html images into raster images or color images, see col. 2 lines 23-32; note that raster images are also referred to as bit map images, see col. 4 lines 55-56);

dividing the web page bitmap image into a plurality of web page bitmap image fragments including a first web page bitmap image fragment and a second web page bitmap image fragment (e.g., see Figs. 2, 3 and col. 2 lines 38-47); and

displaying the first web page bit map image fragment on the display screen (e.g., see Fig. 2).

Tuli_A further teaches dividing a web page x-axis dimension by an x-axis dimension of the display screen and dividing a web page y-axis dimension by a y-axis dimension of the display screen (e.g., see Fig. 2 and col. 2 lines 54-63). Tuli_A does not expressly teach: dividing a web page x-axis dimension by an x-axis dimension of the display screen to obtain a first quotient having a first quotient remainder, dividing a web page y-axis dimension by a y-axis dimension of the display screen to obtain a second quotient having a second quotient remainder, rounding up the first quotient remainder to a first nearest whole number, and

rounding up the second quotient remainder to a second nearest whole number so that each web page image fragment is displayed at an intended resolution of the web page.

Tuli_A; however, suggests that each web page bit map image fragment is substantially or completely covers the displayable area of the display device (e.g., see col. 2 lines 54-63). Tuli_B also discloses that a portion of the image of the web page is equal to or proportional to the size of the browser window 22 in the device (e.g., see Tuli_B [0022]).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have implemented these limitations using Tuli_A suggestions in view of Tuli_B disclosure because both suggest to the skilled artisan that the web page image fragment is equal or proportion to the size of the displayable area of the display device. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to optimize the display area of the device.

While Tuli_A teaches that sections of a web page image are transmitted and displayed in the order of priority such that the priority fragment is transmitted and displayed first (e.g., see col. 2 lines 56-60), Tuli_A does not expressly teach that the proxy sends only one fragment to the hand held display device and that responsive to a request for another fragment, sending another fragment to the hand held display device.

Tuli_B, having the same inventive entity and same system structure, teaches only a portion of a web page image is sent from the host computer to the portable device to be displayed for view by a user (e.g., see [0021]). Tuli_B further teaches responsive to a request for another fragment, sending another fragment to the hand held display device (e.g., see [0022]). Tuli_B expressly discloses sending only the portion of the image that appears in the browser window to the remote device reduces the bandwidth considerably, and conserves on memory in the portable device, compared to sending the entire web page to be stored on the device (e.g., see [0022]). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the web display feature as taught by Tuli_A to

include the feature of sending only one fragment to a hand held display device and sending another fragment to the hand held display device upon request as disclosed in Tuli_B. One would have been motivated to make such a combination is to reduce the bandwidth and conserve on memory in the portable device.

Tuli_A and Tuli_B do not teach: the proxy creates a first unique identifier for the first web page bitmap image fragment that identifies the user with the web page bitmap image fragment and that is a first time, to a nanosecond, that the user requested the web page bitmap image fragment and wherein the proxy creates a second unique identifier for the second web page bitmap image fragment that identifies the user with the second web page bitmap image fragment and that is a second time, to a second nanosecond, that the user requested the second web page bitmap image fragment.

In the same field of endeavor of displaying a web page image on a small display device (e.g., [0014]), Robotham teaches similar structure (e.g., Figs. 1, 2) wherein a web page is accessed through a proxy (e.g., server 22) and wherein the proxy creates a unique identifier for a web page bitmap image fragment that identifies a user with the web page bitmap image fragment (e.g., [0087], [0088], [0195], [0301]; wherein the server 22 prioritizes which parts of the non-overview representations should be sent sooner, based on the history of user interactions) and that includes a time that the user requested the web page image fragments (e.g., [0216]-[0218], [0284]; wherein the client 24 transmits a timestamp for its cached selection region 124 when requesting a refresh). Thus, Robotham discloses the proxy creates a first unique identifier for the first web page bitmap image fragment that identifies the user with the web page bitmap image fragment and that is a first time, to a nanosecond, that the user requested the web page bitmap image fragment and wherein the proxy creates a second unique identifier for the second web page bitmap image fragment that identifies the user with the second web page bitmap

image fragment and that is a second time, to a second nanosecond, that the user requested the

second web page bitmap image fragment.

While Robotham teaches recording a time that the user requested the web page,

Robotham does not teach include time, to a nanosecond. However, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to record time, to a

nanosecond in the timestamp as taught by Robotham to more accurately document the time the

user request the web page image.

According, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to modify the web page display feature as taught by Tuli_A and Tuli_B to

include the feature of keeping tracking of the time the user requests a web page image as

taught by Robotham to achieve the claimed invention. One would have been motivated to make

such a combination is to reduce bandwidth; thus, speed up the communication time.

6.   **Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuli_A,**

Tuli_B and Robotham as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aoki et al. (Pub

No US 2003/0016253 A1; hereinafter Aoki).

As to claim 41, Tuli_A, Tuli_B and Robotham teach the limitations of claim 1 for the

same reasons as set forth in the foregoing rejection of claim 1. Tuli_A further teaches the web

page bit map fragments include a first hyperlink image of a first hyperlink on the first web page,

the first hyperlink linking the first web page to a second web page (e.g., see col. 3 lines 6-10

and lines 24-33); if the user clicks on a part of the image which represents a link, the browser

will go to a new web page (e.g., see col. 1 lines 41-44 and col. 3 lines 24-30). Therefore, Tuli_A

teaches responsive to the web page having a hyperlink to a linked web page, creating a first

hyperlink segment image on the first web page bitmap image fragment and a second hyperlink

segment image on the second web page bitmap image fragment. Tuli_A, Tuli_B and Robotham
do not teach:

responsive to displaying the first web page bitmap image fragment on the display
screen, and responsive to a user moving a cursor over the first hyperlink segment image,
instructing a browser to go to the linked web page; and

responsive to displaying the second web page bitmap image fragment on the display
screen, and responsive to the user moving the cursor over the second hyperlink segment
image, instructing the browser to go to the linked web page.

Aoki teaches that image maps are a widely used technique allowing users to perform
graphical selections of active areas within a displayed image map (e.g., see [0004]). Aoki
suggests to a skilled artisan that:

when a user clicks on a pixel of a first web page bitmap image fragment/area, an image
map instructs the browser to go to the second web page indicated by the web page hyperlink
(e.g., image maps are formed by associating an image with hyperlink targets or active areas.
When a user clicks on one of the hyperlink targets or active areas, the browser displays an
additional hypertext document, see [0004]; further note that image map technology allows *any*
image area to be associated with a hyperlink and that clicking on any pixel or part of the image
area can activate the hyperlink);

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to apply the image map technology as taught by Aoki to the method of
displaying a webpage on a handheld device as taught by Tuli_A and Tuli_B and Robotham to
associate the hyperlink segment with a web page hyperlink so that when the user clicks on the
hyperlink segment, the browser will go to the second web page as claimed. The motivation is to

provide the user of the portable device the ability to click on a hyperlink the same way the user

could on a normal display device.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed on 02/12/2009 have been considered but are not persuasive.

   ♦   Applicant's argument that Tuli_A, Tuli_B and Robotham do not teach "dividing a web

page x-axis dimension by an x-axis dimension of the display screen to obtain a first quotient

having a first quotient remainder, dividing a web page y-axis dimension by a y-axis dimension of

the display screen to obtain a second quotient having a second quotient remainder, rounding up

the first quotient remainder to a first nearest whole number, and rounding up the second

quotient remainder to a second nearest whole number so that each web page image fragment is

displayed at an intended resolution of the web page" (e.g., see Applicant's remark page 4).

      The examiner disagrees. Applicant's arguments fail to provide evidence as to why the

teachings of the combination prior art do not meet the claims because they amount to a general

allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the

language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the combination of references. The

examiner notes this limitation is well-addressed as rejected supra.

   ♦   Applicant's argument that Tuli_A, Tuli_B and Robotham do not teach "the proxy creates

a first unique identifier for the first web page bitmap image fragment that identifies the user with

the web page bitmap image fragment and that is a first time, to a nanosecond, that the user

requested the web page bitmap image fragment and wherein the proxy creates a second unique

identifier for the second web page bitmap image fragment that identifies the user with the

second web page bitmap image fragment and that is a second time, to a second nanosecond,

that the user requested the second web page bitmap image fragment" (e.g., see Applicant's

remark page 5).

The examiner disagrees. Applicant's arguments fail to provide evidence as to why the teachings of the combination prior art do not meet the claims because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the combination of references. In addition, the examiner directs the applicant to the fact that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275,277 (CCPA 1968)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. T. T./

Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179